

Andrew McCarthy, former chief prosecutor, World Trade Center bombing; Riad Nacheh, head of the Association of Islamic Charitable Projects; Raphael Perl, Congressional Research Service; Richard Perle, former assistant secretary of defense; Daniel Pipes, director of the Middle East Forum; Steven Pomerantz, former assistant director of the FBI for counter-terrorism; George Shultz, former secretary of state; Glenn Schweizer, National Science Foundation; William Webster, former director of the FBI and CIA; Phil Wilcox, former coordinator for counterterrorism at the State Department; and Jim Woosley, former director of the CIA.

(Note: This addendum is provided to illustrate the types of people who could serve on the commission and is by no means all-inclusive. There are many more individuals who are fully qualified to be on this commission.)

H.R. —

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. ESTABLISHMENT AND COMPOSITION OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established a national commission on terrorism to review counter-terrorism policies regarding the prevention and punishment of international acts of terrorism directed at the United States. The commission shall be known as "The National Commission on Terrorism".

(b) **COMPOSITION.**—The commission shall be composed of 15 members appointed as follows:

(1) Five members shall be appointed by the President from among officers or employees of the executive branch, private citizens of the United States, or both. Not more than 3 members selected by the President shall be members of the same political party.

(2) Five members shall be appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate, in consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate, from among members of the Senate, private citizens of the United States, or both. Not more than 3 of the members selected by the Majority Leader shall be members of the same political party and 3 members shall be members of the Senate.

(3) Five members shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, in consultation with the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, from among members of the House of Representatives, private citizens of the United States, or both. Not more than 3 of the members selected by the Speaker shall be members of the same political party and 3 members shall be members of the House of Representatives.

(4) The appointments of the members of the commission should be made no later than 3 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) **QUALIFICATIONS.**—The members should have a knowledge and expertise in matters to be studied by the commission.

(d) **CHAIRMAN.**—The chairman of the commission shall be elected by the members of the commission.

#### SEC. 2. DUTIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The commission shall consider issues relating to international terrorism directed at the United States as follows:

(1) Review the laws, regulations, policies, directives, and practices relating to counterterrorism in the prevention and punishment of international terrorism directed towards the United States.

(2) Assess the extent to which laws, regulations, policies, directives, and practices relating to counterterrorism have been effective in preventing or punishing international terrorism directed towards the United

States. At a minimum, the assessment should include a review of the following:

(A) Evidence that terrorist organizations have established an infrastructure in the western hemisphere for the support and conduct of terrorist activities.

(B) Executive branch efforts to coordinate counterterrorism activities among Federal, State, and local agencies and with other nations to determine the effectiveness of such coordination efforts.

(C) Executive branch efforts to prevent the use of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons by terrorists.

(3) Recommend changes to counterterrorism policy in preventing and punishing international terrorism directed toward the United States.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 6 months after the date on which the Commission first meets, the Commission shall submit to the President and the Congress a final report of the findings and conclusions of the commission, together with any recommendations.

#### SEC. 3. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS.

(a) **MEETINGS.**—

(1) The commission shall hold its first meeting on a date designated by the Speaker of the House which is not later than 30 days after the date on which all members have been appointed.

(2) After the first meeting, the commission shall meet upon the call of the chairman.

(3) A majority of the members of the commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number may hold meetings.

(b) **AUTHORITY OF INDIVIDUALS TO ACT FOR COMMISSION.**—Any member or agent of the commission may, if authorized by the commission, take any action which the commission is authorized to take under this Act.

(c) **POWERS.**—

(1) The commission may hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as the commission considers advisable to carry out its duties.

(2) The commission may secure directly from any agency of the Federal Government such information as the commission considers necessary to carry out its duties. Upon the request of the chairman of the commission, the head of a department or agency shall furnish the requested information expeditiously to the commission.

(3) The commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

(d) **PAY AND EXPENSES OF COMMISSION MEMBERS.**—

(1) Each member of the commission who is not an employee of the government shall be paid at a rate equal for the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including travel time) during which such member is engaged in performing the duties of the commission.

(2) Members and personnel for the commission may travel on aircraft, vehicles, or other conveyances of the Armed Forces of the United States when travel is necessary in the performance of a duty of the commission except when the cost of commercial transportation is less expensive.

(3) The members of the commission may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the commission.

(4)(A) A member of the commission who is an annuitant otherwise covered by section

8344 of 8468 of title 5, United States Code, by reason of membership on the commission shall not be subject to the provisions of such section with respect to membership on the commission.

(B) A member of the commission who is a member or former member of a uniformed service shall not be subject to the provisions of subsections (b) and (c) of section 5532 of such title with respect to membership on the commission.

(e) **STAFF AND ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT.**—

(1) The chairman of the commission may, without regard to civil service laws and regulations, appoint and terminate an executive director and up to 3 additional staff members as necessary to enable the commission to perform its duties. The chairman of the commission may fix the compensation of the executive director and other personnel without regard to the provisions of chapter 51, and subchapter III of chapter 53, of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification of positions and General Schedule pay rates, except that the rate of pay may not exceed the maximum rate of pay for GS-15 under the General Schedule.

(2) Upon the request of the chairman of the commission, the head of any department or agency of the Federal Government may detail, without reimbursement, any personnel of the department or agency to the commission to assist in carrying out its duties. The detail of an employee shall be without interruption or loss of civil service status or privilege.

#### SEC. 4. TERMINATION OF COMMISSION.

The commission shall terminate 30 days after the date on which the commission submits a final report.

#### SEC. 5. FUNDING.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR GENERAL  
WILLIAM F. "FRANK" MOORE

#### HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, September 9, 1998*

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Major General William F. "Frank" Moore, United States Air Force, who recently completed a three year assignment as the Director of Special Programs in the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology. The Office of Special Programs deals with the most sensitive and highly classified programs within the Department of Defense (DOD). Throughout his tenure, General Moore has provided steady leadership and has served as a faithful guardian of the Department of Defense's most sensitive programs.

During the 1970s and 1980s, Congress' growing concern with the Department of Defense's management of classified programs resulted in legislation that directed DOD to implement a new structure for overseeing these programs within the Department and an improved process for coordinating with appropriate Congressional committees of oversight. As the Director of the Office of Special Programs, General Moore has worked diligently to ensure an effective working relationship with the House National Security Committee and with the Congress. On behalf of the entire National Security Committee, I would like to

thank General Moore for his service and wish him the best in his new and important assignment as Deputy Director of the Defense Threat Reduction Agency—an agency that will become the Department of Defense's focal point for addressing the many serious threats associated with weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. Speaker, General Moore has served the nation and the Air Force admirably for over 31 years. Throughout his career, the nation has asked a lot of General Moore and his family—his wife, Carol, and their two daughters, Rachel and Laurel. I want to congratulate General Moore on his new assignment, thank him for the job he has done during the past three years as Director of Special Programs, and wish him, and his family, health, happiness and prosperity in the future.

TRIBUTE TO COL. LAWRENCE W. STYS, WISCONSIN WING COMMANDER OF THE CIVIL AIR PATROL

**HON. GERALD D. KLECZKA**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, September 9, 1998*

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a skilled pilot and dedicated public servant, Col. Larry Stys, Wisconsin Wing Commander of the Civil Air Patrol. After 33 years with the CAP, Col. Stys will step down as the Wisconsin Wing Commander October 17.

His lasting legacy is a record unparalleled in the history of the Civil Air Patrol in Wisconsin. He achieved this by hiring the best individuals for duty assignments and inspiring them to the highest principles. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the philosophy of Col. Stys can best be expressed in his own words written to all Wisconsin Unit Commanders:

"I realized that the most important thing in one's life was principles. If one's life was ordered to and grounded in a set of principles, the arrangement of things will fall into line automatically. Principles are more than character traits. Traits can sometimes be worn without truly believing in them. This fundamental basis of character is called integrity. People can look at you and believe you. You can persuade without recourse to cajole."

This philosophy enjoyed obvious success, Mr. Speaker. In 1995, Wisconsin Wing was named best in the region in Search and Rescue proficiency.

And in 1997 during the Air Force Quality Inspection, Wisconsin Wing earned the distinction as best in the nation, excelling in all categories, including an unprecedented 13 benchmarks, which other wings will be rated against. Despite these laudable achievements, Col. Stys repeatedly deflected praise from himself to his staff.

Mr. Speaker, volunteer service is held in such high regard because of the dedication and professionalism of men like Col. Stys. As he leaves his command, we commend his invaluable service, we celebrate his contributions to air safety, and we salute his high regard for standards and principles.

TRIBUTE TO STATE SENATOR  
RALPH DILLS

**HON. GEORGE MILLER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, September 9, 1998*

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to join me in recognizing the retirement of the senior member of the California State Senate, Sen. Ralph Dills. Sen. Dills will leave office at the end of the year, and in August completed his last session in a career that began 60 years ago.

I had the pleasure to know Sen. Dills when I worked as an intern and a staff person in the state Senate in the 1960s and 1970s. A colleague of my father, who was himself a senator then, Sen. Dills was even in those days an institution in Sacramento, and he certainly remains one today.

We all honor his devotion to public service and to the people of the state of California. I would like to submit an editorial from the Sacramento Bee that pays tribute to this distinguished legislator and Californian, and I know all members of this Congress join me in honoring his career.

[From the Sacramento Bee, Sept. 2, 1998]

RALPH DILLS BOWS OUT: SENATOR WAS THE STATE'S LONGEST-SERVING LAWMAKER

Franklin Roosevelt was serving his second term as president when Ralph Dills was first elected to the California Legislature in 1938. President Clinton wasn't yet born, nor were most lawmakers with whom Dills now serves.

Dills arrived in Sacramento from Long Beach, a liberal New Deal Democrat and staunch friend of labor, and he departs 60 years later much the same way. In 1949, he left the Assembly to accept a judgeship, but 17 years later he was elected to the Senate, where he has been ever since, often presiding over sessions, a chore he relished.

One of Dills' proudest achievements was authoring the law that created Long Beach State University; another was the 1977 measure that gave collective bargaining rights to state workers. In speeches lauding him last week, fellow lawmakers remembered that Dills was among a small minority of legislators who opposed the internment of Japanese Americans during World War II.

As a senator, Dills presided over the influential Governmental Organization Committee. The panel handles liquor, horse racing and gambling legislation and has traditionally been a channel for large campaign contributions that Dills used to help keep himself and his fellow Democrats in power.

In his later years, Dills was known less for his legislative prowess than for his colorful attire, purple-tinted hair and saxophone playing. Reapportionment had pushed his district westward, from a gritty inland neighborhood to a more upscale coastal area, forcing him to acquire an environmental sensitivity he'd never shown before. He was 88, ailing and in a wheelchair when he cast his last votes in the Legislature late Monday. However he is ultimately rated, term limits ensure that Ralph Dills' durable presence in Sacramento is unlikely to be repeated.

WHY PATIENT COST-SHARING  
SAVES LITTLE: THE HEALTH  
LESSONS FROM EUROPE

**HON. PETE STARK**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, September 9, 1998*

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, various Members of Congress frequently say that one of the ways to save Medicare is to require the patient to pay a higher share of the cost—thus making the patient a more careful consumer and reducing the demand for care.

Following is a portion of a 1997 study published by the World Health Organization entitled, "European Health Care Reform," which shows why such an approach will save little, but of course will greatly increase the burden on the poorest and sickest in our society. This portion of the study is also interesting in that it shows that in most foreign countries, patients have much more time with their doctor and have much longer hospital length of stays than Americans—yet those foreign societies spend about 30 to 40% less than we do on health care.

Before Americans push more of the burden of Medicare onto the poor and sick, we should look to the lessons from abroad.

THE EFFECTS OF COST SHARING

TOTAL HEALTH EXPENDITURE

Evidence suggests that cost sharing reduces utilization but does not contain costs. Overall costs are not contained because cost sharing is a set of demand-side policies, and costs are primarily driven by supply-side factors. Intercountry comparisons indicate that the United States has lower rates of contact with physicians and beddays per head of population than many other countries, including Canada, France, Germany, Japan and the United Kingdom, but costs in the United States are much higher relative to GDP than in these other countries. This strongly suggests that it is the intensity of care provided per contact in the United States that is responsible for this apparent paradox (198). The United States has the highest out-of-pocket expenses, mostly to meet cost-sharing obligations; it also has the highest overall costs. Other countries have lower cost-sharing and higher utilization rates, but lower costs. This does not mean that cost sharing causes higher costs; it means that measures other than cost sharing (supply-side measures such as budgetary controls) are much more effective mechanisms for cost-containment.

The Rand Study (199,200) suggests that cost sharing is associated with a decrease in total health spending, but the design of the experiment does not really permit strong conclusions to be drawn about the consequences for total expenditure of the broad implementation of cost sharing within a retrospective reimbursement system. The reason is that providers may compensate for a reduction in consumer-initiated demand by inducing increases in service volume or intensity. Table 9, which shows intercountry data (198) on contacts with physicians, hospital days and health expenditure as a percentage of GDP, suggests that consumer-initiated demand is not the major factor driving health care costs. Rather, it appears to be the intensity of services provided. Since intensity is largely provider initiated, there is little scope for cost sharing to make much of an impact on the overall level of spending. . . .